



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,053	12/21/2001	Ernst Schneider	2345/164	4676

26646 7590 03/16/2004

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/937,053

Applicant(s)

SCHNEIDER ET AL.

Examiner

Barry W Taylor

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. For example, claim 24 recites, and a device for comparing the contents of a connection-related reference data record produced by the test unit to the contents of each communications data record of interrelated communications data records produced by the digital switch exchange with regards to a test communications connection. The Examiner is unable to find support for this limitation in Applicant's original specification.

2. Claim 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. For example, claim 29 recites, generating a plurality of interrelated and connection-related communications data records in the digital switching exchange; recognizing interrelated communications data records which

Art Unit: 2643

are assigned to the test communications connection and comparing contents of the connection-related reference data record to contents of each of the interrelated communications data records. The Examiner is unable to find support for this limitation in Applicant's original specification.

Response to Amendment

3. The amendment filed 12/22/03 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Paper number 7, dated 12/22/03, under "MARKED UP VERSION OF THE SUBSTITUTE SPECIFICATION" introduces new matter on page 1 lines 24-28; new matter also found on page 5 line 8 "or alternating between two lines"; new matter also introduced on page 8 lines 8-10 "Another device is used for recognizing interrelated communications data records which are assigned to a test communication connecton".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chin et al (5,729,588 hereinafter Chin).

Regarding claim 18. Chin teaches a system for validating connection-related communications data collected by a digital switching exchange (see Title, abstract), comprising:

at least one test unit (see figure 1 wherein test unit 50), which can be linked to the digital switch (see 30 figure 1), having a first memory unit for storing dedicated communications elements (col. 2 lines 25-52, col. 3 line 8 – col. 4 line 28, col. 6 line 5 – col. 7 line 62), a device for initiating the establishment of at least one dedicated test-communications connection (see figure 1 wherein test unit 50 has a device 20 that produces a test signal), a device for producing a connection-related reference data record from the corresponding communications elements, from the starting and ending instants of the test communications connection (see figures 2a-2b and figures 3a-3b regarding automated message accounting features data, abstract, col. 1 lines 25-52, col. 4 lines 29-34), a device for transmitting the connection-related communications elements to the digital switching exchange (col. 4 lines 29-34);

the digital switching exchange (see 30 figure 1), which functions in response to the received, connection-related communications elements to establish the relevant test communications connection (see figure 1 wherein a device 40 responds to test signal);

a system evaluator (see 60 figure 1) assigned to the test unit (see test unit 50 figure 1) and to the digital switching exchange, including a device for comparing the

Art Unit: 2643

contents of the connection-related reference data record to the contents of each connection-related communications data record belonging thereto (col. 2 lines 44-46, col. 3 lines 25-28, col. 4 lines 2-8 and lines 40-56, col. 6 line 5 – col. 9 line 46),

wherein the digital switch exchange has a device for generating a plurality of communications data records for respective test communications connection and the system evaluator has a device for recognizing communications data records which are assigned to any test communications connection, and a comparator compares each of the communications data records that correspond to the respective reference data record. Chin further shows (see figure 1 wherein controller 70 used for converting into predefined format and col. 2 lines 44-46, col. 3 lines 1-67, col. 4 line 2 – col. 9 line 46) for converting the format of the reference data record into a predefined format and a second device (see figure 1 wherein the digital switch 30 responds to test call by converting into predefined format via 40 and col. 2 lines 44-46, col. 3 lines 1-67, col. 4 line 2 – col. 9 line 46) for converting the format of each communication data record into the predefined format enabling for faulty data to be indicated (col. 7 lines 50-57, col. 8 lines 16-57).

Regarding claims 19-23. Chin teaches wherein the system evaluator (see 60 figure 1), in addition, includes the following features:

A first device (see figure 1 wherein controller 70 used for converting into predefined format and col. 2 lines 44-46, col. 3 lines 1-67, col. 4 line 2 – col. 9 line 46)

Art Unit: 2643

for converting the format of the reference data record into a predefined format and a second device (see figure 1 wherein the digital switch 30 responds to test call by converting into predefined format via 40 and col. 2 lines 44-46, col. 3 lines 1-67, col. 4 line 2 – col. 9 line 46) for converting the format of each communication data record into the predefined format.

Regarding system claims 24-32. See 112 first rejection listed above and amendment objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 also listed above.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

---(5,539,802) De Caluwe et al discloses a system for testing the billing function in a telecommunication system (i.e. "itemized billing") using start code signal (columns 1-2 and the most important instructions listed on column 4).

---(5,579,476) Cheng et al discloses an automated test environment that "catches" data outputted from communication protocol software implemented in the upper and lower communications protocol software (i.e. automatic interpretive test system with a single tester, i.e. the lower and upper tester are combined into a single tester). In other words using communications protocol software implementation under test (a.k.a. "IUT") is tested by emulating the data and control message inputs which may be received from higher and lower communications protocol software and if in response

Art Unit: 2643

to these inputs, the IUT outputs the correct data and control messages (i.e. as per the protocol of the higher or lower layer), the IUT passes the test.

---(5,740,355) Watanabe et al teaches transaction tracing apparatus and also cites Cheng (see Cheng listed directly above) wherein "multiple" pairs of send information and returning information can be set from a singular sequence information. Thus, "conversion" between pluralities of systems can be extracted with a single sequence filter.

---(5,835,566) Cowgill teaches system and method for testing component (i.e. "UUT") having a programmable switch connected to the UUT through telecommunications network via an in-band and out-of-band signaling path providing for a system adaptable to allow for any variations in the operation and protocols that may arise.

---(6,526,124) Swahn et al teaches method for testing an object in a telecommunications system and cites Cowgill (see Cowgill listed directly above) wherein a telecommunications system having incoming side and outgoing side is tested. Swahn also uses common terms such as "IUT" and SUT (i.e. System Under Test) wherein SUT is provided on the interface between two network providers as well as other common terms such as PCOs (i.e. Points of Control and Observation) that are required for testing. In other words, Points of Control and Observation are commonly used for linking the system under test to signaling points.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a) Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 7, last thirteen lines, wherein Applicant's argue that the rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(b) is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1 to 17. Moreover, Applicant's respectfully submit that the Chin reference does not render anticipated new claims 18 to 32.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 18 is a broader version of old claim 1, therefore is rejected for the same reason as old claim 1. Regarding the remaining independent claims (i.e. claims 24 and 29). See Examiner's 112 first rejection and amendment objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 listed in sections 1 to 3 above.

b) Applicant's continue to argue that Chin does not teach the new matter entered independent claims 24 and 29 (see last paragraph on page 8 continuing to last page).

The Examiner notes that Applicant's argue the new matter that has been entered into the specification (see Examiner's 112 first rejection listed and amendment objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 also listed in sections 1 to 3 above.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not


Art Unit: 2643

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor whose telephone number is (703) 305-4811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 customer service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600